

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                             | FILING DATE                         | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/631,995                                  | 07/31/2003                          | Michael J. Lyden     | 279.056US4              | 2198             |
| 21186                                       | 7590 10/02/2006                     |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. |                                     |                      | EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT |                  |
|   | P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                                     |                      | 3762                    |                  |
|   |                                     |                      | DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/631,995  | LYDEN, MICHAEL J.   |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|  | George R. Evanisko  | 3762  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE | l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/31/0  | 03.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| _  | action is non-final.  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |   |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> are subject to restriction and/or e   | lection requirement.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa  | aminer. Note the attached Office  | Action or form PTO-152.   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority</li> <li>application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of</li> </ul>   | s have been received. Shave been received in Application Shave been received in Application Shave been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).                               | on No ed in this National Stage   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)    Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:  | te  |  |  |  |  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to an ERT device, classified in class 607, subclass 29.
- II. Claims 10-18, drawn to a pacing comparison circuit, classified in class 607, subclass 9.
- III. Claims 19-25, drawn to a pacemaker rate of charge storage testing, classified in class 607, subclass 27.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and (I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require a lithium battery or discharging the storage capacitor to a predetermined voltage level. The subcombination has separate utility such as a pacer not requiring the use of comparison circuitry for comparing battery terminal voltage to a brownout voltage, but no comparison circuitry and just used for ERT or rate of charge storage testing for reforming the capacitor.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found

Application/Control Number: 10/631,995

Art Unit: 3762

allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require a pacing capacitor or a discharging the capacitor before the time measurements. The subcombination has separate utility such as a pacer not requiring determining ERT, but used to solely test the rate of charge storage to reform the capacitor.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable

Application/Control Number: 10/631,995

Art Unit: 3762

in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Marvin Beekman on 9/25/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 3762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

George R Evanisko Primary Examiner Art Unit 3762

GRE September 25, 2006